



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,012	04/20/2001	David R. Walt	A-67209-5/RMS/DCF	5049
7590	04/08/2004		EXAMINER	
Robin M. Silva, Esq. FLEHR HOHBACH TEST ALBRITTON & HERBERT LLP Suite 3400 Four Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4187			ALEXANDER, LYLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1743	
DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/840,012	WALT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lyle A Alexander	1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 11-18 and 33-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 11-18 and 33-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 32-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims (1-16 and 27-30); (22-38 and 57-58) of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,410; 6,023,540 respectively. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both are directed to compositions of microspheres/beads immunologically active and label with markers such as fluorescent dyes .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8,11-18 and 32-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are confusing with respect to the first and second optical signatures. It is clear the first optical signature is in response to the analyte of interest. It is not clear what is represented by the second optical signature. Clarification could be achieved if Applicants were to specify the second optical signature is the same as the first in the absence of analyte. Alternatively, the second could be described as different from the first optical signature when either in the presence or absence of analyte. Whatever description is used, Applicants are urged to point out where the language is supported by the original disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 32-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Walt(USP 4,822,747) or Walt(USP 5,143,853).

The cited art teaches analytical chemistry systems comprising a population of beads encoded with fluorescent dyes.

With respect to new claims 32-47, in light of the above 35 USC 112 issues, the claim is best understood as the beads having two optical different optical characteristics, such as by having more than one dye on the bead. The above art clearly teaches beads with multiple dyes/indicators on the beads and has been properly read on the instant claims.

Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 32-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Walt et al.(USP 5,814,524).

The cited art teaches analytical chemistry systems comprising a population of beads encoded with fluorescent dyes.

With respect to new claims 32-47, in light of the above 35 USC 112 issues, the claim is best understood as the beads having two optical different optical characteristics, such as by having more than one dye on the bead. The above art clearly teaches beads with multiple dyes/indicators on the beads and has been properly read on the instant claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue the Walt et al. references are silent to separate subpopulation of beads having unique optical signature indicative of chemical functionalities. The Office maintains all of the references teach beads having associated functionalities that give optical signals in the presence of the analyte of interest. This teaching is indistinguishable from the claimed "optical signature indicative of chemical functionalities".

Applicants state the art teaches populations of beads with encoded different dyes that cannot be read on the claimed system having subpopulations of beads each having a first and second optical signature. The Office maintains the art teaches a population of beads with subpopulations that give a first signal in the presence of analyte and a second optical signal in the absence of analyte that has been properly read on the instant claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lyle A Alexander
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1743

